

paper money. He had never paper money before. In Europe they always used coin. And in China several hundred years ago when Marco Polo went there he found paper money in use and he was enthusiastic about it and described it. But Marco Polo didn't notice or didn't mention something that was far more important than paper money and which was right on the paper money. The paper money was printed and Marco Polo didn't notice that fact, didn't realize it and didn't mention it. Now it is a great thing to have paper money but it is a far greater thing to have ~~prints~~ printing. It just didn't strike him. Now when a person is trying to reconstruct Chinese civilization from Marco Polo's writings and not knowing anything about printing would leave out in his discussion one of the outstanding things that was there that Marco Polo simply didn't realize the significance of.

Now, of course, the situation is somewhat similar if we try to reconstruct the full history of the life of the Israelites in the time of Solomon. Probably to give that to us would have taken a volume the size of the Bible and that is not the purpose of the Bible. The Bible gives a few ~~glims~~ vivid pictures here and there to show ~~that~~ the greatness and the power of his empire.

Number 3. (Question) Otherwise than the Bible there was a book published about forty years ago or more--Blakely--Old Testament History,--Bible History. I forget the name of it. Forty years ago it was considered very excellent. Since that time a new edition has been put out which I believe was put out by a modernist and is full of modernistic statements if I am correctly informed and anyway it's entirely out of date as far as the new ~~article~~ archeological evidence is concerned. It probably still is as good a thing as there is. There is a book published twenty years ago by Ira Morris Price of the University of Chicago called the Dramatic Story of Old Testament History. That book has some statements in it which are somewhat effected by modernism but not many and it has a very good knowledge of the state of archeology as known at that time, twenty years ago. It is not nearly out of date as Blakely's was, but it still is quite out of date